

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

HEARING MINUTES

MARCH 24, 2011

Commissioners

Scott Winnette, Chairman

Robert Jones, Vice Chairman

Timothy Wesolek

Gary Baker

Shawn Burns

Brian Dylus, Alternate (not present)

-

Aldermanic Representative

Michael O'Connor

Staff

Emily Paulus, Historic Preservation Planner

Lisa Mroszczyk, Historic Preservation Planner

Scott Waxter, Assistant City Attorney

Nick Colonna, Division Manager of Comprehensive Planning

Shannon Albaugh, HPC Administrative Assistant

•I. Call to Order

Mr. Winnette called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. He stated that the technical qualifications of the Commission and the staff are on file with the City of Frederick and are made a part of each and every case before the Commission. He also noted that the Frederick City Historic Preservation Commission uses the Guidelines adopted by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation published by the U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and these Guidelines are made a part of each and every case.

All cases were duly advertised in the Frederick News Post in accordance with Section 301 of the Land Management Code.

Announcements

Scott Winnette announced that he would need to recuse himself from case number HPC11-92 located at 11 E. South Street.

Ms. Mroszczyk announced that the Historic Preservation Commission retreat will be held on Thursday March 31, 2011 at the Municipal Office Annex from 6 PM until 8 PM. She also announced that the Historic Preservation Awards ceremony will be held on May 4, 2011 from 7 PM until 9 PM at the new visitor center and the guest speaker will be Gordon Bock, who contributes to the Old House Journal and has a book coming out titled The Vintage House. There will be a wood window workshop on May 14, 2011 from 9 AM until 1 PM which is a training session for the Historic Preservation Commission but will be open to the public as well. Staff also has the "This Place Matters" campaign/contest which is part one of many events that will be held for Preservation Month. Ms. Mroszczyk announced that the new Frederick Town Historic District Design Guidelines were recently printed and there were many years of effort by the Commission as well as citizen volunteers that put a lot of time into the Guidelines and they will be available for purchase in the Planning Department.

Gary Baker announced that on May 21, 2011 the Historic Homes Trade Fair will be held at the Schifferstadt for local homeowners to get a chance to see local craftsmen.

II. Approval of Minutes

1. February 24, 2011 Hearing Minutes

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to approve the February 24, 2011 hearing minutes as written.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 5 - 0

- **II. HPC Business**

- **2. Administrative Approval Report**

- **3. Review and Approval of a Letter to the Planning Commission Regarding the Nicodemus Property**

Discussion

Ms. Mroszczyk stated that currently there are several plans that are being reviewed by the Planning Commission on this property located on Gas House Pike which will potentially negatively impact this historic resource. The Nicodemus property is an intact farmstead with a federal style brick dwelling dating from the early 19th Century along with a bank barn, dairy barn and other outbuildings. She stated that originally the property was the Brengle homestead and was built by Captain John Brengle a distinguished Frederick resident and leader of the War of 1812. It was later occupied by his equally distinguished son Lawrence Brengle and leader against the Secessionist Movement. It is significant for these associations and for its architecture as well as for its association with the City's agricultural heritage, evidence of which is becoming increasingly rare. The Brengle farm was developed at the time when agriculture was expanding and Frederick was one of the most important and productive agricultural counties in the state. Ms. Mroszczyk added that most recently the property was identified as an individual property

potentially eligible for a Historic District Overlay Designation on the historic resources map in the 2010 Comprehensive Plan. In 2008 the research was initially completed on the property when the plans first came into the Planning Commission and it was submitted to them at that time with recommendations to preserve the setting in context of the site in cooperation of the proposed development. Even though the farmhouse will be retained the loss of its associated outbuildings and context with greatly diminish the significance of this resource.

Mr. Winnette stated that he would be willing to sign the letter to go to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Wesolek stated that he thought it was not the Historic Preservation Commission's job to go to a property that is outside of the Historic District and tell them what they need to do. He stated that the HPC is tasked on a specific area of property and to tell somebody that the Commission thinks they should do this is the wrong way to go. Mr. Winnette stated that he thought the Commission should wait two weeks before making a decision since Mr. Wesolek had such a strong opinion about this matter so the Commission will have more time to study the information given to them. He also encouraged the Commission to look into the Land Management Code to follow through on what is their actual jurisdiction when it comes to seeking designations. He asked staff to give the Commission a line out of what the LMC tells them about initiating designations. Ms. Mroszczyk answered that there is a process established for designation of properties outside of areas that are already designated areas. There is the Frederick Town Historic District which is one district. There is the John Duerr House that is another individually designated property outside of the Historic District. She added that it is the Commission's mission to preserve resources throughout the City, not just in areas that are already designated. This is part of the Certified Local Government which includes pursuing a designation program. The process would be either the Planning Commission, Historic Preservation Commission, The Planning Department, Elected Official or Property Owner would initiate a designation and there would need to be a scheduled public hearing where public notice signs would need to be posted and notification would need to go out to adjacent property owners, then there would be a public hearing and the Commission would vote on a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Then the Planning Commission would evaluate it using criteria that they look at and the designation would go to their hearing with the some public notice and it would then go on to the Mayor & Board of Aldermen with the same public notice. The Mayor & Board would ultimately be the body that would make a decision.

IV. Consent Items

-

a. Cases to be Approved

-

b. Cases to be Continued

-

4. HPC10-440

230 W. Patrick Street

Way Station, Inc.

Applicant requests a continuance to April 14, 2011

Vince Anibaldi

Lisa Mroszczyk

Vote: 5 - 0

-

•V. Cases to be Heard

5. HPC11-81

106 W. 4th Street

Judith Candela

Revisions to previously-approved addition

Emily Paulus

Staff Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking approval for several modifications to a previously-approved rear addition (HPC 10-164). The modifications include the following:

1. A 2' by 2' opening on the west wall of the second floor rear porch. The applicant is requesting to install an operable 2/2 window in the opening;
2. A 16" by 16" attic vent in the gable end of the rear addition;
3. Two exterior entry lights at each of the doors on the rear (south) wall of the addition;
4. Exposure of the underside of the cantilevered second floor porch (which was original approved to be enclosed with painted bead board);
5. A galvanized window well along the east elevation.

Applicant Presentation

Judy Candela, owner of 106 W. 4th Street, stated that as far as the 2 by 2 window she would like to go with a piece of the fire rated glass with the historic window in front of that as long as that meets the building code. She added that from her backyard she can look out and see another property with exposed joists under their porch so she would like to keep the joists on her porch exposed. She added that the joists are exposed in the kitchen so if they are left exposed on the porch there would be continuity and she was willing to treat them with polyurethane.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Baker suggested chamfering or beading the corners and edges of the exposed porch joists to make it more of a decorative feature and still keeping the wood that is there exposed. Ms. Candela liked the idea of beading the joists more than any other suggestion she had heard. Mr. Baker stated that the first choice would be to still put beaded board on it as originally approved but beading the joists only would be an option.

Mr. Winnette asked Ms. Paulus if the option to chamfer or bead the joists would change her recommendation. Ms. Paulus answered that the main part of her concern would still exist since they would still be unpainted like the rest of the wood on the addition. She added that in terms of what the Commission routinely approves they have generally told people they need to finish the underside. She appreciated the suggestion but the staff recommendation would most likely remain the same.

Mr. Winnette agreed with the staff recommendation that consistently porches were beaded board with no exposed beams.

Mr. Jones thought that chamfering or beading the edges would catch a lot of light and it will not carry like they think it is going to carry. He also commended the applicant on their craftsmanship on the addition.

Mr. Wesolek stated that if the Commission could use the new construction angle he had no problem allowing the applicant to polyurethane the beams to let their natural beauty show and use the materials that we have to make them last so the applicant can have the exposed beams. Ms. Paulus clarified that it is an addition not new construction so when looking at the Guidelines they should be looking at the addition section of the Guidelines rather than new construction.

Mr. Baker asked the Commission if they found it to be contradictory that the second story porch is covered up and the first floor not. Mr. Winnette and Mr. Jones answered yes.

Mr. Wesolek asked if the applicant would be willing to continue the porch portion of the application for two weeks. Ms. Candela answered yes.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the following:

- The 2' x 2' opening and installation of a 2/2 wood window on the west wall of the rear porch, with the condition that the fire rating issue be resolved with a Building Code official prior to the issuance of the HPC Certificate of Approval. If the opening must be closed off, materials to match the rest of the wall should be used.
- The attic vent as installed, with condition that it be painted to match the color of the wall
- The installed Portfolio light fixtures at the first and second floor rear entry doors
- The window well at the east elevation basement window, to be finished with a veneer of brick or stone

Staff recommends denial of the exposed underside of the rear porch, as it is not compatible with the character of rear porches in the historic district.

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to approve the 2' x 2' opening and installation of a 2/2 wood window on the west wall of the rear porch, with the condition that the fire rating issue be resolved with a Building Code official prior to the issuance of the HPC Certificate of Approval and if the fire rated glass is required the Commission should give approval for that so both windows would be there and if the applicant chooses to not go with that solution the motion should include the permission that the applicant close off that opening with materials that would match the rest of the wall and consult with staff on that; and the approval for the attic vent as installed, with condition that it be painted to match the color of the wall; as well as the approval for the installation of Portfolio light fixtures at the first and second floor rear entry doors; and finally the approval for the east elevation basement window, to be finished with a veneer of brick or stone.

Second: Timothy Wesolek

Vote: 5 - 0

Porch Ceiling

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to continue the portion of the application that deals with the exposed underside of the rear porch until the April 14, 2011 hearing.

Second: Scott Winnette

Vote: 4 - 1, Gary Baker opposed

6. HPC11-85

424 N. Bentz Street

Mark & Susan Bird

Replace roof

Emily Paulus

Staff Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking approval to replace an existing asphalt shingle roof in-kind with CertainTeed Landmark Architectural Shingles. The roofing to be replaced includes both the front and rear roof slopes.

Applicant Presentation

Mark Bird, owner of 424 N. Bentz Street, stated that in the proposal they are looking at an architectural shingle rather than a three tab shingle. He added that their personal home is in the Historic District and they do like to take care of their properties in a manner to make it historic. He went on to say that there are two levels of shingles on the roof right now with 1" plank board underneath it so it would need to be replaced rather than repaired.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Baker asked what the applicant was going to do with flashing around the chimney and such things. Mr. Bird answered the 032 round step flashing in a bronze color would be installed.

Mr. Winnette asked how the new shingles would be matched up with the old shingles on the duplex. Mr. Bird answered that they would match it together so that there will be no leakage through there and they will try to interlace it as best they can.

Mr. Baker asked if they were going to do the concealed ridge vent. Mr. Bird answered that he would like to. Mr. Baker explained to the Commission that there would be a cap running at the top on the ridge which would be different from the neighbor's. He added that it would be a shingle but there would be a raised portion to it. Mr. Bird stated that the reason for that was to keep air circulating underneath the boards which would prevent moisture from penetrating the boards. Mr. Baker understood that but stated that there are mushrooms and such things that can be put on the backside of it. Mr. Bird suggested leaving the ridge cap off of the roof.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Motion: Robert Jones moved to approve the request to replace the existing asphalt shingle roof in-kind with a dimensional or specialty shingle in a grey/charcoal color to match the existing as closely as possible. The final shingle type and color selection should be submitted to staff for approval prior to purchase and installation and removal of the ridge vent.

Vote: 5 - 0

Staff Presentation

- New ground cover and a pedestrian path at the right-of-way along West 7th Street
- The installation of nine (9) freestanding precast concrete planters of various sizes along North Bentz Street

According to the applicant, the funding for the upgrades is being donated by a private foundation that wishes to see additional greening of the area. The management company for the units has agreed to dedicate resources to maintain the plantings, which will be codified in a Memorandum of Agreement.

Applicant Presentation

Tim Daniel, representing Zavos Architecture & Design, stated that one of the reasons behind the 7th Street upgrade is because that area is a void due to a gap between the 7th Street widening, which was a future improvement that was part of the original approval. He thought that staff's thoughts on the potential concerns about too much hard surface and lowering them to allow for taller green space is a welcomed suggestion. He stated that regarding the 10' planter at the corner they thought dividing into two could be an improvement but another alternative could be to chamfer the corners. The intent on having it 10' wide planter is to relate to the bay window directly above it and to integrate it into the building.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Wesolek asked the applicant to define ground cover. Mr. Daniel answered that the intent is to have green cover the ground that would not require mowing or extensive maintenance but something that would basically cover the ground. He mentioned something that could fill that area in a robust fashion but will not tend to overgrow if it is bounded well, which will be part of a landscape plan.

Mr. Baker suggested the idea to make the planters something more integral to the building and put maybe something like a gossip bench parallel to the sides of the stoops to add more greenery while solving the issue of the trip hazard from the front stoops. Mr. Daniel agreed in regard to the stoops and he stated that most of what drove the stoops was the grading because the ground floor units have to be accessible in terms of zero step entry. Mr. Daniel welcomed the suggestion of placing the planters parallel to the stoops.

Public Comment

Lisa Ausherman was concerned about the work that has been done and the way it looks right now because it looks unfinished and for the amount of money, time and effort that has been put into this project they need to see something that is admirable. She stated that they were open to suggestions and they thought planters could be something permanent and would not get kicked around or damaged while also giving the opportunity for height and greenery.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the landscaping upgrades to a portion of the Hope VI project along 7th and Bentz Streets, as show in drawings A-1a, A-1b, A-2, A-3, and A-4, dated 2-17-11, with the following conditions:

- The planters be filled with appropriately full, year-round vegetation, the majority of which should be at least the same height as the planter itself;
- The final planting plan be submitted to staff for approval (in consultation with the City Arborist) prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- The management company for the units agrees to dedicate resources to maintain the plantings, as codified in a Memorandum of Agreement.

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to approve the landscaping upgrades to a portion of the Hope VI project along 7th and Bentz Streets, as show in drawings A-1a, A-1b, A-2, A-3, and A-4, dated 2-17-11, with the following conditions:

- § The planters be filled with appropriately full, year-round vegetation, the majority of which should be at least the same height as the planter itself and that the applicant consider lowering the planters;
- § The final planting plan be submitted to staff for approval (in consultation with the City Arborist) prior to the issuance of a building permit;
- § The management company for the units agrees to dedicate resources to maintain the plantings, as codified in a Memorandum of Agreement; and that
- § The locations and the form of the planters be negotiated to deal with the stoops if possible.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 5 - 0

8. HPC11-92

11 E. South Street

Fred Michel

Replace door

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this applicant seeks post-construction approval for the installation of a six panel steel entry door and removal of wood door frame at the rear of the property.

Applicant Presentation

Fred Michel, the applicant, stated that this was a tremendous oversight on his part because he thought they were simply repairing a drafty doorway. He added that they replaced the old door, which was leaking, rusting and drafty with a nearly identical insulated steel door. In addition to that they also replaced some rotten wood around the framing of the door so they were simply just trying to improve the thermal qualities in the apartment.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Baker asked if they were finished with the installation or if they had been stopped. Mr. Michel answered that it is mostly finished and there may be some finishing touches to be done. He added that they were waiting to see what the Commission decided but they did put foam around the boards and they have mortar mix which they are planning to use. Mr. Baker asked where the mortar mix would be applied. Mr. Michel answered around the frame of the door because some of the bricks had to be removed when they removed some of the rotten wood.

Mr. Baker stated that the previous door never would have been approved because of the arched top so it was good that the applicant put a solid door back from a historical stand point only. He added that the door being steel is not an acceptable material according to the Guidelines.

Mr. Baker asked the applicant if he would be opposed to replacing the insulated steel door with an insulated wood door. Mr. Michel answered that he would have security concerns if a wood door was installed.

Mr. Jones asked the applicant to review the Masonry Treatment section of the Guidelines when they are making the necessary repairs to secure the brick because it did not appear to be the proper mortar mixture.

Mr. Wesolek thought that a wooden door needed to be put in and the area around the door would need to be cleaned up so the door frame looks more secure. Mr. Wesolek asked if the applicant would amend the application to replace the door with a wooden door. Mr. Michel answered that if that is what it would take to get the matter behind him then he would put in some type of wooden door.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission deny the application because the proposed door is neither compatible to the period and style of the building nor fit into the opening in the same manner as the original door.

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to approve the application with the following conditions:

- § The applicant replace the door with a six panel wood door;
- § Proper drawings are submitted that shows how the door is going to be fit within the opening
- § The brick around the door be reinstalled properly; and
- § All conditions be submitted for staff approval

Second: Gary
Baker

Vote: 4 - 0

9. HPC11-110

500-600 N. Bentz Street

Teresa Justice

Solar panels, additional modifications to Level II approval
agent

Tim Daniel,

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant seeks amendments to previous approvals for the North Market Street Revitalization (Hope VI) project, now known as North Pointe. The proposed amendments include the following:

1. Substituting the previously approved wood lap siding and trim with fiber cement siding and trim;
2. Installing photovoltaic panels on the roofs;
3. Installing low profile solar tubes on the rears of lots 18-20, 22-27, 34-39, 41, 42, 45, 46, 50, 51, 56-61, 68 and 67;
4. Replacing the previously approved wood doors with fiberglass doors of the same style;
5. Raising the basement height by one foot on all lots;
6. Removal of an existing tree from lot 7; and
7. Installing a running board wood fence on lots 8 and 9 only.

The applicant obtained approval for the installation of solar panels and the use of fiber cement siding on lots 2-11, 47-52, 54-59 at the hearing on July 22, 2010 (HPC10-194, 10-195, 10-196).

NOTE: The carports have been withdrawn from this application and submitted under HPC11-134 which will be discussed at the workshop.

Applicant Presentation

Tim Daniel, with Zavos Architecture & Design, agreed with staff's concerns about removing the tree and they appreciated the old growth. He was concerned about the damage the tree may endure during the construction of the car ports of the second parking spot which is the reason they would like the tree to be removed. Mr. Daniel added that the tree would compromise the efficiency of the solar panels. He stated that as a compromising measure they would be willing to plant additional trees of the same species that over time can compensate in some manner. Mr. Daniel acknowledged that some of the details on the half light fiber glass doors were projected but he reminded the Commission that they are on rear elevations. He added that there are energy goals for the houses and the fiber glass doors with insulation do have greater insulation than wooden doors. Mr. Daniel went on to say that not allowing the panels on the fronts would not allow all the houses to be at net zero. They requested for consistency in not only the design aspect but also for those living there that there be consideration for the front facing panels. Mr. Daniel stated that there is almost no front and rear in this project which they think is a good thing.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Ms. Mroszczyk stated that the plans show a half light on the front on duplex 18. Mr. Daniel thought that having those on the front was not the most objectionable thing because of the porches and the added molding that would normally catch the light will not stand out.

Mr. Baker asked if all the units were going to be raised by a foot or so. Mr. Daniel answered yes and the height you see on the drawing reflects the raise in height. Mr. Baker thought the smaller basement windows looked out of proportion since the buildings are going to be raised in height. Mr. Daniel stated that the reason for the raise in height is because the client would like to provide 9' ceilings for increased livability and they are not able to make the basements deeper in terms of excavating because the sanitary lines were run into the lots during the initial construction phase for the apartment portion.

Mr. Baker wondered why the floor level was 2' or 3' higher the head of the basement windows. Mr. Daniel stated that window is established by the minimum code required sill height which is 44" for an emergency escape window. They also have to have a certain window size for egress in emergency rescue so that drove the height of the window and because there is a 9' basement that gives them the added height between the head and floor level.

Mr. Baker stated that an 8' ceiling versus a 9' ceiling makes it nicer but at a basement level it is not overly needed. He added that most basements in the Historic District barely have 7' let alone 8' and they are going to 9'. Mr. Baker thought the raise in elevation needed to be studied further. Mr. Winnette asked if the applicant would be willing to continue to the case to the workshop so it could be discussed further. Mr. Daniel asked if there were aspects that they could continue and then approve aspects that the Commission has a comfort level with since this project is under construction and some aspects that need to be moved forward on. Mr. Winnette answered that the raise in the elevation could be continued as well as the solar panels, fiber glass doors and the removal of the tree. He added that there seemed to be some agreement with the approval of the siding, solar tubes, fence and solid wood panel doors.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of substituting the previously approved wood lap siding and trim with HardiePlank siding and trim with a smooth finish for all lots because it is compatible with the appearance and detail of traditional siding materials in the historic district and does not

detract from the streetscape with the condition that if the material is to be prefinished and not painted, that the applicant submit the final color selections associated with each lot for staff approval.

Staff recommends approval of the installation of Schuco MPE modules MS 05 series solar panels as proposed on lots 18- 20, 22-26, 35- 39, 60, 61, 67, 68, on the rear only of lots 27 and 34 and on the rear half of side facing roof slopes only on lots 14-17 and 30-31 because their placement is consistent with the guidelines as described in this report.

Because the applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed buildings could not be designed so that the solar panels are located on the rear or obscured from view from the street, or that photovoltaics compatible with the texture, size, shape and scale of materials in the historic district could not be utilized, staff recommends denial of the installation of solar panels on lots 29, 32 and 41-46, on the front of lots 27 and 34 and on the front half of side facing roof slopes on lots 14-17 and 30-31.

Staff recommends approval of the installation of Velux 14" low profile model TGR/TGF sun tunnels as proposed.

Staff recommends approval of the substitution of Therma-Tru Smooth Star painted fiberglass doors to match the configuration of the previously approved solid panel wood doors only because they are compatible with the quality and detail of wood doors. Staff recommends denial of the substitution of fiberglass doors in the case of the previously approved wood sash doors because their detailing is appropriate for this historic district as further described in this report.

Staff recommends denial of the removal of the tree in lot 7.

Staff recommends approval for the installation of a running board wood fence in the rear yards of lots 8 and 9.

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to approve substituting the previously approved wood lap siding and trim with HardiePlank siding and trim with a smooth finish for all lots because it is compatible with the appearance and detail of traditional siding materials in the historic district and does not detract from the streetscape with the condition that if the material is to be prefinished and not painted, that the applicant submit the final color selections associated with each lot for staff approval, as well as the installation of Velux 14" low profile model TGR/TGF sun tunnels as proposed, also the approval of the installation of a running board wood fence in the rear yards of lots 8 and 9, and the approval of the substitution of Therma-Tru Smooth Star painted fiberglass doors to match the configuration of the previously approval solid panel wood doors only because they are compatible with the quality and detail of wood doors.

Second: Shawn Burns

Vote: 5 - 0

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to continue the installation of the solar panels on all lots, the height raise at the sidewalk grade from 3' to 4', as well as the fiber glass doors and the request to remove the tree to the workshop later that evening and the hearing on April 14, 2011

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 5 - 0

10. HPC11-111

210 W. South Street

Lisa Mroszczyk

Replace basement door, walkway and patio, reinstall railing
agent

Tom Murphy,

Emily Paulus

Staff Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking approval to replace a deteriorated wooden basement door with a new Gordon metal door with concrete side walls. It would be painted to match the house. The door is located along the east side of the house within an alcove; it is not visible from West South Street.

Other proposed work includes the reinstallation of a missing handrail at the front entrance, installation of aluminum K-style gutters and downspouts on the garage, and replacement of the existing raised deck patio and walkway in the rear yard with brick.

Applicant Presentation

Tom Murphy, the agent, concurred with the staff report.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Baker was concerned about the stone corner being damaged if the new basement doors came out another 8". Lisa Mroszczyk, the property owner, stated that they were originally going to use an extension because with the placement of the downspout the door cannot be opened fully without hitting the downspout but that would bring it down too far and it would interfere with the brick wall they are going to have to adjust the downspout so they do not need the extension to make the door open.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval to install a new Gordon metal basement door with concrete side walls, to be painted to match the house, because the existing basement door is not original and the Commission's *Guidelines* allow for metal doors in locations that are not visible from a public street.

In addition, staff recommends approval of the reinstallation of a missing handrail at the front entrance, installation of aluminum K-style gutters and downspouts on the garage, and replacement of the existing raised deck patio and walkway in the rear yard with brick. Final details will be coordinated with staff prior to issuance of the building permit.

Materials to be approved include:

- Scope of work, dated 3/3/11
- Site plan, showing location of basement door, patio, and walkway
- Catalogue cut sheets: Gordon cellar door (model RD-0), Amerimax 5" x 10" white aluminum gutter, Amerimax 2" x 3" white aluminum downspout
- Photos showing existing conditions

Motion: Robert Jones moved to approve the install a new Gordon metal basement door with concrete side walls, to be painted to match the house, because the existing basement door is not original and the Commission's *Guidelines* allow for metal doors in locations that are not visible from a public street and in addition the approval of the reinstallation of a missing handrail at the front entrance, installation of aluminum K-style gutters and downspouts on the garage, and replacement of the existing raised deck patio and walkway in the rear yard with brick. Final details will be coordinated with staff prior to issuance of the building permit.

Materials to be approved include:

- § Scope of work, dated 3/3/11
- § Site plan, showing location of basement door, patio, and walkway
- § Catalogue cut sheets: Gordon cellar door (model RD-0), Amerimax 5" x 10" white aluminum gutter, Amerimax 2" x 3" white aluminum downspout
- § Photos showing existing conditions

Second: Shawn
Burns

Vote: 5 - 0

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:55 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Albaugh

Administrative Assistant